REMARKS

I. Status of Claims

Claim 1-20 are pending.

Claims 1-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 USC 112.

Claims 1, 3-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Eggers (US 6,437,509).

Claims 2, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers in view of Neiger et al. (US 4,937,496).

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers in view of Makoto (JP 11-123577).

Claims 1-19 are currently amended.

Claim 20 is a new claim.

Claims 1, 15 are amended to overcome the rejections. Claims 2-14 and 16-19 are amended for consistency with amended Claim 1 and to correct minor informalities.

Claim 1 is amended to include the feature that the electrode comprises a 'continuous pin', with the corresponding deletion of the 'shaft and pin shaped head part'. This is supported by the text on page 7, line 19, describing Fig. 3 which clearly shows the continuous pin. A continuous pin is also shown in the embodiments of Figs. 4-10.

Claim 20 is a new claim to an electrode comprising a shaft which defines a first longitudinal axis, and a head part which defines a second longitudinal axis, the shaft part and the head part positioned so that the second longitudinal axis is transverse to the first longitudinal axis, and in which at least one hole is positioned in the head part and arranged transversely with respect to the second longitudinal axis. This is supported by the text on page 8, line 36 to page 9, line 7 in combination with the text on page 4, lines 17-20, which describes the embodiment of Fig. 11, in combination with the text on page

6, line 33 to page 7, line 3, which describes the electrode, shown in Fig. 11, of the lamp shown in Fig. 1.

II. Rejections under 35 USC 112

Claims 1-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 USC 112.

Claim 1 is amended to remove the word 'preferably' and the following limitation.

Claim 1 is amended to remove the words 'in particular'.

Claim 2 has been amended to include the antecedent basis for the diameter D in the form of inclusion of the continuous pin of the new amendment to Claim 1.

Claim 3, although not objected to, is correspondingly amended to include antecedent basis for the diameter D2 of Claim 3, in view of the amendment to Claim 1 to replace the 'shaft and pin shaped head part' with 'continuous pin'.

Claim 9 is amended to include the antecedent basis for the plurality of holes. Claim 10, dependent on Claim 9, therefore now also contains sufficient antecedent basis for the feature of the plurality of holes.

Claim 11 is amended to include the antecedent basis for the value D.

Claim 12 is amended to include the antecedent basis for the 'tip'.

Claim 13 is amended to include the antecedent basis for the value D but also to include the antecedent basis for the 'tip'.

Claim 15 is amended to remove the words 'in particular'.

Claim 17 is amended to include the antecedent basis for the laser beam.

Claim 18 is amended to include the antecedent basis for the rate of repetition.

Claim 19 is amended to include the antecedent basis for the energy density and is amended to remove the word 'material' for which there is no antecedent basis.

Although not specifically included in the Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112, the Examiner objected to the parentheses in Claims 13 and 14. These have been removed.

III. Rejections under 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 3-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Eggers (US 6,437,509).

The reasoning put forward in the Office Action of 04/06/2009 states that Eggers discloses 'an electrode for metal vapor-containing discharge lamps made from a high-melting, electrically conductive material, comprising a shaft (13) and a pin-shaped head part (17), which defines a longitudinal axis, characterized in that at least one hole (20, 20') is arranged essentially transversely with respect to the longitudinal axis, at an angle of 60 to 90 degrees with respect to the longitudinal axis in the region of the head part (17)', page 4 of the Office Action, lines 8-13. In fact since the head part (17) is described in the text of Eggers as a 'body', for example col. 3, lines 44, 47 and 54, we believe that it is the shaft which is pin-shaped, rather than the head part (17) and that Eggers does not, in fact, disclose a 'pin-shaped head part'. For that reason, at least, we believe that the previous wording of Claim 1 was novel with respect to Eggers, however to improve clarity and understanding of Claim 1 we have amended the wording of the Claim as previously stated.

The subject matter of amended claim 1 now recites an electrode for metal vapor-containing discharge lamps, made from a high-melting, electrically conductive material comprising a *continuous pin* (our emphasis) which defines a longitudinal axis L, wherein at least one hole is arranged *in the continuous pin* (our emphasis), the hole arranged at an angle of 60 to 90 degrees with respect to the longitudinal axis. Therefore in the subject matter of claim 1 the hole is situated in the continuous pin itself. In contrast, Eggers shows that the hole (20, 20') is in a separable head part (17) and not in the shaft (13) itself. Therefore we believe the relative position of the holes as claimed in Claim 1 and as described in Eggers is distinct and different and that therefore the subject matter of Claim 1 is novel in view of Eggers for at least these reasons.

Claims 3-11 and 13, being dependent on Claim 1, are therefore also novel in view of Eggers for at least the reasons stated above.

IV. Rejections under 35 USC 103

Claims 2, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers.

With regard to our comments above, Eggers does not show the subject matter of new Claim 1, and in particular does not show the hole (20, 20') in a continuous pin, but rather discloses a hole in a body (17) arranged around a shaft (13). There is no teaching nor any hint or suggestion in Eggers to remove the body (17) and to place the hole (20, 20') in the shaft (13) instead. Therefore we believe Claims 2, 14 and 15 are also non-obvious in view of Eggers.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers in view of Neiger et al. (US 4,937,496).

With regard to our comments above, Eggers does not show the subject matter of new Claim 1, and in particular does not show the hole (20, 20') in a continuous pin. Neiger does not cure this deficiency and does not disclose an electrode comprising a hole. Therefore we believe Claim 12 is non-obvious with respect to Eggers in view of Neiger.

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers in view of Makoto (JP 11-123577).

With regard to our comments above, Eggers does not show the subject matter of new Claim 1, and in particular does not show the hole (20, 20') in a continuous pin. Makoto does not cure this deficiency and does not disclose an electrode, neither does it disclose an electrode comprising a hole. Therefore we believe Claims 16-19 are non-obvious with respect to Eggers in view of Makoto.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and allowance of the pending claims.

Dated: June 25, 2009

Respectfully Submitted,

By _____

Christopher Frerking
Reg. No: 42,557

Viering, Jentschura & Partner
3770 Highland Ave.
Suite 203
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
Phone: (415) 670-9081
Fax: (617) 849-5451
vjp-us@vjp.de

Attorney for Applicant